UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,634	11/28/2001	Daryl Dean Schroeder	10015860-1	7723

7590 05/19/2008

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PHAM, TUAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/994,634	SCHROEDER, DARYL DEAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUAN A. PHAM	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 February 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-14 and 21-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-14, and 21-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's remark, filed on 02/06/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-3, 5-14, and 21-30 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745).

(I) Applicant's argument:

In response to applicant's remark on pages 9-11, Applicant argues that Riazi fails to teach a display driver and video-audio receiver and demodulator does not translate data as recited in claim 25.

In response to applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument. Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., display driver) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, the video-audio receiver and demodulator convert the RF signal receive from the transceiver 128 of the base station 20 to provide the video data to display 14 (see figure 8, col.6, 1-15). Therefore, the teaching of Aiazi still read on.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added subject matter of "a second display driver coupled between the second computer display device and the second monitor wireless transceiver, wherein the second display driver is configured to: receive from the second monitor wireless transceiver video data contained in wireless signals transmitted from the computer wireless transceiver, translate the received video data from the second monitor wireless transceiver to produce translated video data, and provide the translated video data to the second computer display device" to independent claim 28 is considered new matter because the specification as original filed does not provide to support for such limitation. In the specification, page 7, ln.1-5 disclosed a multiple monitors but the multiple monitors did not have a specific of the arrangement in claim 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi")**.

Regarding claim 25, Riazi teaches a computer system comprising (see figure 1):

a computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30);

a computer wireless transceiver connected to said computer main unit (see figures 1&9, modem 128 is inside the base station 20, computer 30), and

a first wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, wireless monitor 10), including: a monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 1, figure 8, wireless monitor 14, data radio modem 112) configured to receive from the computer main unit via the computer wireless transceiver video data corresponding to a video signal (see figure 1, figures 8-9, data radio modem 112 is received the video data from the computer 30 via the data radio modem 128 of the base station 20);

a computer display device connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and communicating signals to and receiving communication signals from said monitor

wireless transceiver (see figure 8, display 14 receive the video data from data radio modem 112), and

data translation means (see figure 8, read on a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110), coupled between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110, display 14, data radio modem 112), for receiving from the monitor wireless transceiver video data contained in wireless signals transmitted from the computer wireless transceiver (see figure 8, col.6, ln.1-15, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 convert the RF signal receive from the transceiver 128 of the base station 20 to provide the video data to display 14), translating the received video data to produce translated video data, and providing the translated video data to the computer display device (see col.6, ln.1-15, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 convert the RF signal receive from the transceiver 128 of the base station 20 to provide the video data to display 14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745, hereinafter, "Beetesson").

Regarding claim 1, Riazi teaches a computer system (see figure 1), comprising:

a computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30),

a computer wireless transceiver connected to a computer main unit (see figure 1, figure 9, data radio modem 128, base station 20, main computer 30);

a monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 1, figure 8, wireless monitor 14, data radio modem 112) configured to receive from the computer main unit via the computer wireless transceiver video data corresponding to a video signal (see figure 1, figures 8-9, data radio modem 112 is received the video data from the computer 30 via the data radio modem 128 of the base station 20);

a computer display device (see monitor 14), connected to the monitor wireless transceiver (data radio modem 112), for receiving communication signals from the monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, display 14 receive the video data from data radio modem 112) ; and

a video- audio receiver and demodulator (see figure 8, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110) coupled between the computer display device and the monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110, display 14, data radio modem 112) wherein a video- audio receiver and demodulator is configured to receive from the monitor wireless transceiver video data contained in wireless signal transmitted from the computer wireless transceiver (see figure 1, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 convert the RF signal receive from the transceiver of the base station 20 to provide the video data to display 14), translate the received video data to produce translated video data, and provide the translated video

data to the computer display device (see col.6, ln.1-15, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 convert the RF signal receive from the transceiver of the base station 20 to provide the video data to display 14).

It should be noticed that Riazi fails to teach a display driver. However, Beeteson teaches a display driver (see figure 3, col.3, ln.16-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Beeteson into view of Riazi in order to provide the information to the user via a display screen.

Regarding claim 2, Riazi further teaches a computer system wherein the computer wireless transceiver and the monitor wireless transceiver are configured to employ radio frequency (RF) communications (see figure 1, col.3, ln.61).

Regarding claim 3, after combine, Riazi further teaches a computer system wherein the computer wireless transceiver and the monitor wireless transceiver are configured to employ radio frequency (RF) communications (see figure 1, col.3, ln.61). Beeteson teaches IR communication (see figure 3, IR transceiver 29).

Regarding claim 5, Riazi further teaches said monitor wireless transceiver and said computer display device comprise a wireless computer monitor (see figures 1&8, wireless monitor 10, modem 112, display 14) and wherein said wireless computer-monitor further comprises: an audio port capable of connecting one or more audio devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, audio port 24, col.4, ln.12-15); and an audio driver (see figure 8, video and audio 110); wherein said audio port and said audio driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are capable of

relaying data between said computer main unit and said one or more audio devices in a wireless manner (see figures 1, 8, video and audio 110, audio port 24, computer 30).

Regarding claim 6, Riazi further teaches the audio port and the audio driver relay data to and from the one or more audio devices (see figure 1, figure 8, audio port 24, audio demodulator 110, speaker 52, MIC 54, col.4, ln.25-40).

Regarding claim 26, Riazi disclosed invention, but fails to disclose display driver. However, Beeteson teaches a display driver (see figure 3, col.3, ln.16-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Beeteson into view of Riazi in order to provide the information to the user via a display screen.

7. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745, hereinafter, "Beetesson") as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nakayama et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,280,583, hereinafter, "Nakayama").

Regarding claim 7, Riazi further teaches said monitor wireless transceiver and said computer display device comprise a wireless computer monitor (see figures 1&8, wireless monitor 10, modem 112, display 14) and wherein said wireless computer-monitor further comprises: a keyboard port capable of connecting a keyboard to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, monitor 10, keyboard port 32); and wherein said keyboard port is connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and axe capable of

relaying data from said keyboard to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 1, figure 8, modem 112, keyboard 90, keyboard port 32, col.6, ln.29-36).

Riazi and Beetesson, in combination, fails to teach a keyboard driver. However, Nakayama teaches a keyboard driver (see figure 6, keyboard driver 12, col.9, ln.40-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nakayama into view of Riazi and Beetesson in order to store the code inputting from the keyboard as suggested by Nakayama at col.9, ln.45-46.

Regarding claim 8, Riazi further teaches said monitor wireless transceiver and said computer display device comprise a wireless computer monitor (see figures 1&8, wireless monitor 10, modem 112, display 14) and wherein said wireless computer-monitor further comprises: a pointing device port capable of connecting one or more pointing devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 8, mouse 16, it is clearly that there is a port for connecting the mouse 16); and wherein said pointing device port and said pointing device driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are capable of relaying data from said one or more pointing devices to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 8, modem 112, display 14, col.6, ln.29-36).

Riazi and Beetesson, in combination, fails to teach a pointing device driver. However, Nakayama teaches a pointing device driver (see figure 6, PD driver 13, col.9, ln.45-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nakayama into view of Riazi and Beetesson in order to store the code inputting from the pointing device as suggested by Nakayama at col.9, ln.45-50.

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Gawne (US Pub. No.: 2002/0165007).

Regarding claim 27, Riazi disclosed invention, but fails to teach a second wireless monitor, and wherein each of said first and second wireless monitors has a unique address for wireless communication, such that each of said first and second wireless monitors is capable configured to receive unique data from said computer concurrently with the other of said first and second wireless monitors. However, Gawne teaches a second wireless monitor, and wherein each of said first and second wireless monitors has a unique address for wireless communication, such that each of said first and second wireless monitors is capable configured to receive unique data from said computer concurrently with the other of said first and second wireless monitors (see [0006].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gawne into view of Riazi in order to provide a low cost system as suggested by Gawne at [0004].

9. Claims 9-10, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold").

Regarding claim 9, Riazi teaches a computer system, comprising (see figure 1):

a computer wireless transceiver (see figure 1, figure 9, modem 128), coupled to said computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30, base station 20 which include modem 128), for relaying wireless communications to and from said computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30, base station 20 which include modem 128); and

a first wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, wireless monitor 10), said first wireless computer monitor comprising; a monitor wireless transceiver performing wireless communications (see figure 8, modem 112); and a computer display device connected to said monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, modem 112, display 14), said monitor wireless transceiver is configured to wirelessly communicate with computer wireless transceiver (see figures 1, 8-9, monitor 10 is wirelessly communicate with base station 20 via wireless link 12).

It should be noticed that Riazi fails to teach a computer main unit having a unique address associated therewith, However, Batke teaches a computer main unit having a unique address associated therewith (see col.13, ln.8-45, each computer assign its own unique address).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Batke into view of Riazi in order to support multiple computers over network.

Riazi and Batke, in combination, fails to teach said wireless communication includes data and said unique address. However, Arnold teaches said wireless communication includes data and said unique address (see col.6, ln.13-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Arnold into view of Riazi and Batke in order to support multiple computers over network.

Regarding claim 10, Riazi further teaches a computer system wherein the computer wireless transceiver and the monitor wireless transceiver are configured to employ radio frequency (RF) communications (see figure 1, col.3, ln.61).

Regarding claim 12, Riazi further teaches said wireless computer-monitor further comprises: an audio port capable of connecting one or more audio devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, audio port 24, col.4, ln.12-15); and an audio driver (see figure 8, video and audio 110); wherein said audio port and said audio driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are capable of relaying data between said computer main unit and said one or more audio devices in a wireless manner (see figures 1, 8, video and audio 110, audio port 24, computer 30).

Regarding claim 13, Riazi further teaches the audio port and the audio driver relay data to and from the one or more audio devices (see figure 1, figure 8, audio port 24, audio demodulator 110, speaker 52, MIC 54, col.4, ln.25-40).

10. Claims 11, 14, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold") as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745, hereinafter, "Beetesson").

Regarding claim 11, Riazi, Batke, and Arnold, in combination, fails to teach IR communication. However, Beetesson teaches IR communication (see figure 3, IR transceiver 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Beetesson into view of Riazi, Batke, and Arnold in order to support short range.

Regarding claim 14, Riazi teaches said wireless computer monitor further comprises a video-audio receiver and demodulator connected between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver, the monitor wireless transceiver to receive wireless signals containing video data, the a video-audio receiver and demodulator to translate video data contained in the received wireless signals to translated video data provided to the computer display device (see col.6, ln.1-15, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 convert the RF signal receive from the transceiver of the base station 20 to provide the video data to display 14).

It should be noticed that Riazi fails to teach a display driver. However, Beeteson teaches a display driver (see figure 3, col.3, ln.16-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Beeteson into view of Riazi in order to provide the information to the user via a display screen.

Regarding claim 24, after combine, Riazi teaches a wireless computer monitor (see figure 1). Beeteson further teaches said monitor further comprises a display driver connected between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 3, monitor 20 is included display screen 22, display driver 21, RF transceiver 28).

11. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold") as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Gawne (US Pub. No.: 2002/0165007).

Regarding claim 21, Riazi teaches a wireless computer system that included wireless monitor and wireless PC. Riazi, Batke, and Arnold, in combination, fails to teach a second wireless monitor, said second wireless computer monitor having a unique address for wireless communication, and including a monitor wireless transceiver performing wireless communications, and a computer display device connected to said monitor wireless transceiver of the second wireless computer monitor, wherein said second wireless monitor is configured to receive unique data from and transmit unique data to said computer main unit in a wireless manner through said

monitor wireless transceiver and said computer wireless transceiver, concurrently with said first wireless computer monitor. However, Gawne teaches a second wireless monitor, said second wireless computer monitor having a unique address for wireless communication, and including a monitor wireless transceiver performing wireless communications, and a computer display device connected to said monitor wireless transceiver of the second wireless computer monitor, wherein said second wireless monitor is configured to receive unique data from and transmit unique data to said computer main unit in a wireless manner through said monitor wireless transceiver and said computer wireless transceiver, concurrently with said first wireless computer monitor (see [0006], it is clearly seen that the each of the operator unit should include the wireless transceiver in order to communicate wirelessly with personal computer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gawne into view of Riazi, Batke, and Arnold in order to provide a low cost system as suggested by Gawne at [0004].

Regarding claim 30, Gawne further teaches the first wireless computer monitor also has a unique address (see [0006]).

12. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold") as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Nakayama et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,280,583, hereinafter, "Nakayama").

Regarding claim 22, Riazi further teaches a keyboard port capable of connecting a keyboard to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, monitor 10, keyboard port 32); and wherein said keyboard port is connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and axe capable of relaying data from said keyboard to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 1, figure 8, modem 112, keyboard 90, keyboard port 32, col.6, ln.29-36).

Riazi, Batke, and Arnold, in combination, fails to teach a keyboard driver. However, Nakayama teaches such feature (see figure 6, keyboard driver 12, col.9, ln.40-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nakayama into view of Riazi, Batke, and Arnold in order to store the code inputting from the keyboard as suggested by Nakayama at col.9, ln.45-46.

Regarding claim 23, Riazi further teaches a pointing device port capable of connecting one or more pointing devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 8, mouse 16, it is clearly that there is a port for connecting the mouse 16); and wherein

said pointing device port and said pointing device driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are capable of relaying data from said one or more pointing devices to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 8, modem 112, display 14, col.6, ln.29-36).

Riazi, Batke, and Arnold, in combination, fails to teach a pointing device driver. However, Nakayama teaches such feature (see figure 6, PD driver 13, col.9, ln.45-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Nakayama into view of Riazi, Batke, and Arnold in order to store the code inputting from the pointing device as suggested by Nakayama at col.9, ln.45-50.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-8097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have question on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/TUAN A PHAM/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Tuan Pham